

# Interferometric detection of gravitational waves: the definitive test for General Relativity

Christian Corda

June 8, 2009

Associazione Scientifica Galileo Galilei, Via Pier Cironi 16 - 59100 PRATO,  
Italy

*E-mail address:* [cordac.galilei@gmail.com](mailto:cordac.galilei@gmail.com)

## Abstract

Even if Einstein's General Relativity achieved a great success and overcame lots of experimental tests, it also showed some shortcomings and flaws which today advise theorists to ask if it is the definitive theory of gravity. In this essay we show that, if advanced projects on the detection of Gravitational Waves (GWs) will improve their sensitivity, allowing to perform a GWs astronomy, accurate angular and frequency dependent response functions of interferometers for GWs arising from various Theories of Gravity, i.e. General Relativity and Extended Theories of Gravity, will be the definitive test for General Relativity. The papers which found this essay have been the world's most cited in the official Astroparticle Publication Review of ASPERA during the 2007 with 13 citations.

- Essay dedicated to my wife Maria and written for the 2009 Gravity Research Foundation Awards: Honorable Mention Winner

Recently, the data analysis of interferometric GWs detectors has been started (for the current status of GWs interferometers see [1]) and the scientific community aims in a first direct detection of GWs in next years.

Detectors for GWs will be important for a better knowledge of the Universe and either to confirm or rule out the physical consistency of General Relativity or of any other theory of gravitation [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. In fact, in the context of Extended Theories of Gravity, some differences between General Relativity and the others theories can be pointed out starting by the linearized theory of gravity [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. In this picture, detectors for GWs are in principle sensitive also to a hypothetical *scalar* component of gravitational

radiation, that appears in extended theories of gravity like scalar-tensor gravity [4, 8, 9, 10, 12], bi-metric theory [5], high order theories [2, 3, 6, 7], Brans-Dicke theory [13] and string theory [14].

Motivations of extending General Relativity arise from the fact that, even if Einstein's Theory [15] achieved a great success (see for example the opinion of Landau who says that General Relativity is, together with Quantum Field Theory, the best scientific theory of all [16]) and overcame lots of experimental tests [15], it also showed some shortcomings and flaws which today advise theorists to ask if it is the definitive theory of gravity [17, 18]. Differently from other field theories like the electromagnetic theory, General Relativity is very difficult to be quantized. This fact rules out the possibility of treating gravitation like other quantum theories, and precludes the unification of gravity with other interactions. At the present time, it is not possible to realize a consistent Quantum Gravity Theory which leads to the unification of gravitation with the other forces [17, 18].

On the other hand, one can define *Extended Theories of Gravity* those semi-classical theories where the Lagrangian is modified, in respect to the standard Einstein-Hilbert gravitational Lagrangian, adding high-order terms in the curvature invariants (terms like  $R^2$ ,  $R^{\alpha\beta}R_{\alpha\beta}$ ,  $R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ ,  $R\Box R$ ,  $R\Box^k R$ ) or terms with scalar fields non minimally coupled to geometry (terms like  $\phi^2 R$ ) [17, 18]. In general, one has to emphasize that terms like those are present in all the approaches to perform the unification between gravity and other interactions. More, from a cosmological point of view, such modifies of General Relativity generate inflationary frameworks which are very important as they solve lots of problems of the Standard Universe Model [19]. Note that we are not telling that General Relativity is wrong. It is well known that, even in the context of Extended Theories, General Relativity remains the most important part of the structure [4, 7, 17, 18]. We are only trying to understand if weak modifies on such a structure could be needed to solve some theoretical and observing problems [17, 18]. In this picture, we also recall that even Einstein told that General Relativity could not be definitive [28]. In fact, during his famous research on the Unified Field Theory, he tried to realize a theory that he called "Generalized Theory of Gravitation", and he said that mathematical difficulties precluded him to obtain the final equations [28].

In the general context of cosmological evidences, there are also other considerations which suggest an extension of General Relativity. As a matter of fact, the accelerated expansion of the Universe, which is today observed, shows that cosmological dynamic is dominated by the so called Dark Energy, which gives a large negative pressure. This is the standard picture, in which such new ingredient is considered as a source of the *right side* of the field equations. It should be some form of un-clustered non-zero vacuum energy which, together with the clustered Dark Matter, drives the global dynamics. This is the so called "concordance model" ( $\Lambda$ CDM) which gives, in agreement with the CMBR, LSS and SNeIa data, a good tapestry of the today observed Universe, but presents several shortcomings as the well known "coincidence" and "cosmological constant" problems [20]. An alternative approach is changing the *left side* of the

field equations, seeing if observed cosmic dynamics can be achieved extending General Relativity [17, 18, 21, 22]. In this different context, it is not required to find out candidates for Dark Energy and Dark Matter, that, till now, have not been found, but only the “observed” ingredients, which are curvature and baryon matter, have to be taken into account. Considering this point of view, one can think that gravity is different at various scales [21] and a room for alternative theories is present. In principle, the most popular Dark Energy and Dark Matter models can be achieved considering  $f(R)$  theories of gravity, where  $R$  is the Ricci curvature scalar, and/or Scalar-Tensor Gravity [17, 18, 22].

In this essay we show that, if advanced projects on the detection of GWs will improve their sensitivity, allowing to perform a GWs astronomy [1], accurate angular and frequency dependent response functions of interferometers for GWs arising from various Theories of Gravity, i.e. General Relativity and Extended Theories of Gravity, will be the definitive test for General Relativity [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12]. The papers which found this essay have been the world’s most cited in the official Astroparticle Publication Review of ASPERA during the 2007 with 13 citations [23]. We recall that ASPERA is the network of national government agencies responsible for coordinating and funding national research efforts in Astroparticle Physics, see [30].

Working with  $G = 1$ ,  $c = 1$  and  $\hbar = 1$  (natural units), the line element for a GW arising from standard General Relativity and propagating in the  $z$  direction is [1, 15, 24, 25]

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - dz^2 - (1 + h_+)dx^2 - (1 - h_+)dy^2 - 2h_\times dx dy, \quad (1)$$

where  $h_+(t+z)$  and  $h_\times(t+z)$  are the weak perturbations due to the  $+$  and the  $\times$  polarizations which are expressed in terms of synchronous coordinates in the Transverse Traceless (TT) gauge [15]. In [24, 25] it has been shown that the total frequency and angular dependent response function (i.e. the detector pattern) to the  $+$  polarization of an interferometer with arms in the  $u$  and  $v$  directions in respect to the propagating GW is:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}^+(\omega) &\equiv \Upsilon_u^+(\omega) - \Upsilon_v^+(\omega) \\ &= \frac{(\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi)}{2L} \tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi) - \frac{(\cos^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi - \cos^2 \phi)}{2L} \tilde{H}_v(\omega, \theta, \phi), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

that, in the low frequencies limit ( $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ) gives the well known low frequency response function of [26, 27] for the  $+$  polarization:

$$\tilde{H}^+(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos^2 \theta) \cos 2\phi + O(\omega). \quad (3)$$

For a sake of clearness, let us sketch the derivation of eq. (2). The rotation in respect to the  $u$  and  $v$  directions is

$$\begin{aligned}
x &= -u \cos \theta \cos \phi - v \cos \theta \sin \phi + w \sin \theta \\
y &= u \sin \phi - v \cos \phi \\
z &= u \sin \theta \cos \phi + v \sin \theta \sin \phi + w \cos \theta,
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

with the correspondent line element transformation [24, 25]

$$g^{ik} = \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial x'^l} \frac{\partial x^k}{\partial x'^m} g'^{lm}, \tag{5}$$

By using (4) and (5), and taking into account only the + polarization, the line element in the  $\vec{u}$  direction becomes:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + [1 + (\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi) h_+(t + u \sin \theta \cos \phi)] du^2. \tag{6}$$

Following [24, 25, 29], a good way to analyse variations in the proper distance (time) is by means of “bouncing photons”. A photon can be launched from the interferometer’s beam-splitter to be bounced back by the mirror. The “bouncing photons analysis” was created by Rakhmanov in [29]. Actually, it has strongly generalized to angular dependences, scalar waves and massive GWs in [2, 4, 12, 24, 25].

The condition for null geodesics ( $ds^2 = 0$ ) in eq. (6) gives the coordinate velocity of the photon:

$$v_p^2 \equiv \left(\frac{du}{dt}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{[1 + (\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi) h_+(t + u \sin \theta \cos \phi)]}, \tag{7}$$

which will be used for calculations of the photon propagation time between the beam-splitter and the mirror [24, 25, 29]. We assume that the beam splitter is located in the origin of the new coordinate system (i.e.  $u_b = 0$ ,  $v_b = 0$ ,  $w_b = 0$ ). Being in the TT gauge, the coordinates of the beam-splitter  $u_b = 0$  and of the mirror  $u_m = L$  do not change under the influence of the GW [15, 25], thus the duration of the forward trip can be written as

$$T_1(t) = \int_0^L \frac{du}{v_p(t' + u \sin \theta \cos \phi)}, \tag{8}$$

with

$$t' = t - (L - u).$$

In the last equation  $t'$  is the delay time (i.e.  $t$  is the time at which the photon arrives in the position  $L$ , so  $L - u = t - t'$ ).

At first order in  $h_+$  this integral can be approximated with

$$T_1(t) = T + \frac{\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi}{2} \int_0^L h_+(t' + u \sin \theta \cos \phi) du, \tag{9}$$

where, as we are using natural units,  $T = L$  is the transit time of the photon in absence of the GW. Similarly, the duration of the return trip will be

$$T_2(t) = T + \frac{\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi}{2} \int_L^0 h_+(t' + u \sin \theta \cos \phi)(-du), \quad (10)$$

though now the delay time is

$$t' = t - (u - l).$$

The round-trip time will be the sum of  $T_2(t)$  and  $T_1[t - T_2(t)]$ . The latter can be approximated by  $T_1(t - T)$  because the difference between the exact and the approximate values is second order in  $h_+$ . Then, to first order in  $h_+$ , the duration of the round-trip will be

$$T_{r.t.}(t) = T_1(t - T) + T_2(t). \quad (11)$$

By using eqs. (9) and (10) one sees immediately that deviations of this round-trip time (i.e. proper distance) from its unperturbed value are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta T(t) = & \frac{\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi}{2} \int_0^L [h_+(t - 2T - u(1 - \sin \theta \cos \phi)) + \\ & + h_+(t + u(1 + \sin \theta \cos \phi))] du. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Now, using the Fourier transform of the  $+$  polarization of the field, defined by

$$\tilde{h}_+(\omega) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt h_+(t) \exp(i\omega t), \quad (13)$$

one obtains in the frequency domain:

$$\delta \tilde{T}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} (\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi) \tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi) \tilde{h}_+(\omega), \quad (14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi) = & \frac{-1 + \exp(2i\omega L)}{2i\omega(1 + \sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi)} + \\ & + \frac{-\sin \theta \cos \phi ((1 + \exp(2i\omega L)) - 2 \exp i\omega L (1 - \sin \theta \cos \phi))}{2i\omega(1 + \sin \theta \cos^2 \phi)} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

and we immediately see that  $\tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi) \rightarrow L$  when  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ .

Thus, by defining the “signal” in the  $u$  arm like  $S(\omega) \equiv \frac{\delta \tilde{T}(\omega)}{2T}$ , the total response function of this arm of the interferometer to the  $+$  component is:

$$\Upsilon_u^+(\omega) \equiv \frac{S(\omega)}{\tilde{h}_+(\omega)} = \frac{(\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi)}{2L} \tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi). \quad (16)$$

In the same way, one gets the response function of the  $v$  arm of the interferometer to the  $+$  polarization:

$$\Upsilon_v^+(\omega) = \frac{(\cos^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi - \cos^2 \phi)}{2L} \tilde{H}_v(\omega, \theta, \phi) \quad (17)$$

where, now

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_v(\omega, \theta, \phi) = & \frac{-1 + \exp(2i\omega L)}{2i\omega(1 + \sin^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi)} + \\ & + \frac{-\sin \theta \sin \phi ((1 + \exp(2i\omega L)) - 2 \exp i\omega L (1 - \sin \theta \sin \phi))}{2i\omega(1 + \sin^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi)}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

with  $\tilde{H}_v(\omega, \theta, \phi) \rightarrow L$  when  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ .

The total response function is defined like the difference between (16) and (17), thus one obtains immediately eq. (2).

The same analysis works for the  $\times$  polarization (see [24, 25] for details). One obtains that the total frequency and angular dependent response function of an interferometer to the  $\times$  polarization is:

$$\tilde{H}^\times(\omega) = \frac{-\cos \theta \cos \phi \sin \phi}{L} [\tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi) + \tilde{H}_v(\omega, \theta, \phi)], \quad (19)$$

that, in the low frequencies limit ( $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ), gives the low frequency response function of [26, 27] for the  $\times$  polarization:

$$\tilde{H}^\times(\omega) = -\cos \theta \sin 2\phi + O(\omega). \quad (20)$$

The case of massless Scalar-Tensor Gravity has been discussed in [4, 12] with a “bouncing photons analysis” similar to the previous one. In this case, the line-element in the TT gauge can be extended with one more polarization, labelled with  $\Phi(t + z)$ , i.e.

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - dz^2 - (1 + h_+ + \Phi)dx^2 - (1 - h_+ + \Phi)dy^2 - 2h_\times dx dy. \quad (21)$$

The total frequency and angular dependent response function of an interferometer to this “scalar” polarization is [4, 12]

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}^\Phi(\omega) = & \frac{\sin \theta}{2i\omega L} \{ \cos \phi [1 + \exp(2i\omega L) - 2 \exp i\omega L (1 + \sin \theta \cos \phi)] + \\ & - \sin \phi [1 + \exp(2i\omega L) - 2 \exp i\omega L (1 + \sin \theta \sin \phi)] \}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

that, in the low frequencies limit ( $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ), gives the low frequency response function of [9, 14] for the  $\Phi$  polarization:

$$\tilde{H}^\Phi(\omega) = -\sin^2 \theta \cos 2\phi + O(\omega). \quad (23)$$

In [2, 3, 4, 7] it has also been shown that, in the framework of GWs, the cases of massive Scalar-Tensor Gravity and  $f(R)$  theories are totally equivalent

(this is not surprising as it is well known that there is a more general conformal equivalence between Scalar-Tensor Gravity and  $f(R)$  theories, even if there is a large debate on the possibility that such a conformal equivalence should be a *physical* equivalence too [17, 18, 21]). In such cases, because of the presence of a small mass, a longitudinal component is present in the third polarization, thus it is impossible to extend the TT gauge to the third mode [2, 3, 4, 6, 7]. But, by using gauge transformations, one can put the line-element due to such a third scalar mode in a conformally flat form [2, 3, 4, 6, 7]:

$$ds^2 = [1 + \Phi(t - v_G z)](-dt^2 + dz^2 + dx^2 + dy^2). \quad (24)$$

If the interferometer arm is parallel to the propagating GW, the longitudinal response function, which has been obtained in [2, 7] with the “bouncing photons analysis”, associated to such a massive mode is

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_l(\omega) = & \frac{1}{m^4 \omega^2 L} \left( \frac{1}{2} (1 + \exp[2i\omega L]) m^2 \omega^2 L (m^2 - 2\omega^2) + \right. \\ & -i \exp[2i\omega L] \omega^2 \sqrt{-m^2 + \omega^2} (4\omega^2 + m^2(-1 - iL\omega)) + \\ & + \omega^2 \sqrt{-m^2 + \omega^2} (-4i\omega^2 + m^2(i + \omega L)) + \\ & + \exp[iL(\omega + \sqrt{-m^2 + \omega^2})] (m^6 L + m^4 \omega^2 L + 8i\omega^4 \sqrt{-m^2 + \omega^2} + \\ & \left. + m^2(-2L\omega^4 - 2i\omega^2 \sqrt{-m^2 + \omega^2})) + 2 \exp[i\omega L] \omega^3 (-3m^2 + 4\omega^2) \sin[\omega L] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where  $m$  in eq. (25) is the small mass of the particle associated to the GW and  $v_G$  in eq. (24) is the particle’s velocity (the group velocity in terms of a wave-packet [2, 7]). The relation mass-velocity is  $m = \sqrt{(1 - v_G^2)}\omega$ , see [2, 7] for details.

Thus, if advanced projects on the detection of GWs will improve their sensitivity allowing to perform a GWs astronomy (this is due because signals from GWs are quite weak) [1], one will only have to look the interferometer response functions to understand if General Relativity is the definitive theory of gravity. In fact, if only the two response functions (2) and (19) will be present, we will conclude that General Relativity is definitive. If the response function (22) will be present too, we will conclude that massless Scalar - Tensor Gravity is the correct theory of gravitation. Finally, if a longitudinal response function will be present, i.e. Eq. (25) for a wave propagating parallel to one interferometer arm, or its generalization to angular dependences, we will learn that the correct theory of gravity will be massive Scalar - Tensor Gravity which is equivalent to  $f(R)$  theories. In any case, such response functions will represent the definitive test for General Relativity. This is because General Relativity is the only gravity theory which admits only the two response functions (2) and (19) [4, 7, 17, 18]. Such response functions correspond to the two “canonical” polarizations  $h_+$  and  $h_\times$ . Thus, if a third polarization will be present, a third response function will be detected by GWs interferometers and this fact will rule out General Relativity like the definitive theory of gravity.

Resuming, in this essay we have shown that, by assuming that advanced projects on the detection of GWs will improve their sensitivity allowing to perform a GWs astronomy, accurate angular and frequency dependent response functions of interferometers for gravitational waves arising from various Theories of Gravity, i.e. General Relativity and Extended Theories of Gravity, will be the definitive test for General Relativity.

### Acknowledgements

I thank my wife Maria for her love and her support in my research work. This essay is dedicated to her. The Associazione Scientifica Galileo Galilei has to be thanked for supporting this essay.

### References

- [1] A. Giazotto - Journ. of Phys., Conf. Series 120, 032002 (2008)
- [2] C. Corda - J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. JCAP04009 (2007)
- [3] C. Corda - Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. A 23, 10, 1521-1535 (2008)
- [4] Capozziello S and C. Corda - Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15**, 1119 -1150 (2006)
- [5] C. Corda - Astropart. Phys. 28, 2, 247-250 (2007)
- [6] C. Corda - Astropart. Phys. 30, 4 209-215 (2008)
- [7] S. Capozziello, C. Corda and M. F. De Laurentis - Phys.Lett. B, 669, 5, 255-259, (2008)
- [8] T. Damour and G. Esposito-Farese - Class. Quant. Grav. **9** 2093-2176 (1992);
- [9] C. Corda - Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. A 22, 26, 4859-4881 (2007)
- [10] S. Capozziello, C. Corda and M. F. De Laurentis - Mod. Phys. Lett. A 22, 35, 2647-2655 (2007)
- [11] S. Capozziello, C. Corda and M. F. De Laurentis - Mod. Phys. Lett. A 22, 15, 1097-1104 (2007)
- [12] C. Corda - Mod. Phys. Lett. A No. 22, 23, 1727-1735 (2007)
- [13] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke - Phys. Rev. 124, 925 (1961)
- [14] N. Bonasia and M. Gasperini - Phys. Rew. D **71** 104020 (2005)
- [15] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler - “Gravitation” - W.H.Feeman and Company - 1973

- [16] L. Landau and E. Lifshits - “Teoria dei campi” - Editori riuniti edition III (1999)
- [17] S. Capozziello and M. Francaviglia - Gen. Rel. Grav. 40, 2-3, 357 (2008)
- [18] V. Faraoni and T. P. Sotiriou - arXiv:0805.1249, to appear in Rev. Mod. Phys.
- [19] A. Starobinsky - Phys. Lett. B, 91, 99-102 (1980)
- [20] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra - Rev. Mod. Phys. 75 8559 (2003)
- [21] C. M. - Will *Theory and Experiments in Gravitational Physics*, Cambridge Univ. Press Cambridge (1993)
- [22] T. Inagaki, S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov - J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. JCAP0506010 (2005)
- [23] [http://www.aspera-eu.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=125&Itemid=99](http://www.aspera-eu.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=125&Itemid=99)
- [24] C. Corda - Astropart. Phys. **27**, No 6, 539-549 (2007)
- [25] C. Corda - Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **16**, 9, 1497-1517 (2007)
- [26] K. S. Thorne- *300 Years of Gravitation* - Ed. Hawking SW and Israel W Cambridge University Press p. 330 (1987)
- [27] P. Saulson - *Fundamental of Interferometric Gravitational Waves Detectors* - World Scientific, Singapore (1994)
- [28] A. Pais - *Subtle is the Lord* - Oxford University Press (2005)
- [29] Rakhmanov M - Phys. Rev. D **71** 084003 (2005)
- [30] <http://www.aspera-eu.org>